Document: Plan
Date of RTC Check: 2/15/2018

Primary Comments 1 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 2 Adequate response is conditional to submittal of the survey monument map. Response to this comment will be after the desired approval of the FSP. Accordingly the FSP will be conditionally approved since a task hazard analysis (THA) for Bathymetry work will not be developed prior to the desired approval date and 1 week before field work begins 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. 3 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 9 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 9 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 9 Response is adequate pending review of described or outlined in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data	Comment Number	Did Response Address Comment?	Confirmed
1 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP 2 Adequate response is conditional to submittal of the survey monument map. Response to this comment will be after the desired approval of the FSP. Accordingly the FSP will be conditionally approved since a task hazard analysis (THA) for Bathymetry work will not be developed prior to the desired approval date and 1 week before field work begins 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 De Considered Comments 1 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. 3 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a OA/CC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the OAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collecte	Drimary Commonts		Change in FSP
Adequate response is conditional to submittal of the survey monument map. Response to this comment will be after the desired approval of the FSP. Accordingly the FSP will be conditionally approved since a task hazard analysis (THA) for Bathymetry work will not be developed prior to the desired approval date and 1 week before field work begins 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. 3 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 7 The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a OA/OC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the OAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 7 The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropripriate response. The comment is a deliverables from the sampling		Response is adequate pending review of undated FSP	2
Response to this comment will be after the desired approval of the FSP. Accordingly the FSP will be conditionally approved since a task hazard analysis (THA) for Bathymetry work will not be developed prior to the desired approval date and 1 week before field work begins 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. 3 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/OC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet to objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to def	•		
the FSP. Accordingly the FSP will be conditionally approved since a task hazard analysis (THA) for Bathymetry work will not be developed prior to the desired approval date and 1 week before field work begins 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. 3 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a OA/OC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the OAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an approp	2	monument map.	
5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? To be Considered Comments 1 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. 3 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	3	the FSP. Accordingly the FSP will be conditionally approved since a task hazard analysis (THA) for Bathymetry work will not be developed prior to the desired approval date and 1 week	
To be Considered Comments Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a OA/OC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP Response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	4	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?
1 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. 3 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 7 The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	5	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?
Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	To be Considered Com	nments	
Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary. Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the OAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	1	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?
4 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 5 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 8 Response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	2	needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contigency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this	
The response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP ? The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	3	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?
The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 8 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 7 The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data Matters of Style Comments	4	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?
The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan. 7 Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? 8 Response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data Matters of Style Comments	5	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?
Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP? The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data Matters of Style Comments		The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan.	?
The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data Matters of Style Comments	7	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	
and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The 9 comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data Matters of Style Comments	8	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?
Matters of Style Comments	9	and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform	?
	Matters of Style Comr		<u> </u>
I INCORPTION TO AGREGATE POPULATION OF THE CONTROL	1	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	?

2	This response again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement that "no analysis (evaluation) will be incuded in the FSPs" and misses the point of the comment. The comment is pointing to the stated deliverables, one of which is identified as field investigation summary type report. The comment is suggesting to include a summary of any deviations from the FSP, which is a standard section to include in a field investigation report, rather than hunting for deviations within all of the field notes.	?
Legend		
	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	

Indicates a Conditional Approval need and callout for extra attention to the RLSO in the FSP and/or QAPP

Not responsive and needs correction